

## REMARKS

The Amendments address 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, rejections.

In claim 4, the number 45 unintentionally appearing in the second formula for Z has been removed. The same problem was also present in claim 38, which is also fixed.

Claims 4 and 32-34 are amended. While applicants disagree with the Examiner regarding whether these process claims are indefinite for failure to recite an isolation step for reasons of record, applicants amend the claim to overcome the rejections. The same rejection is also made with respect to claim 5; however, claim 5 is directed to a process for making a composition and not a single compound. Thus, no amendment is made to claim 5 as an isolation step is not needed to make a composition.

Claim 7 is amended to recite that the administration is “for a time and under conditions effective to treat” the claimed diseases.

Claim 33 is amended to avoid the use the rejected term “functional derivative.”

Claims 1 and 20 are amended to further clarify that the “derivative” term in the line second to last in the claims refers back to the derivatized Gly and derivatized Ala recited earlier in said claims.

Claim 44 is amended to correct the improper dependence of the claim on claim 23. From the context of the claims it is clear that claim 32 was intended.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Csaba Henter, (Reg. No. 50,908)  
Anthony J. Zelano (Reg. No. 27,969)  
Millen, White, Zelano & Branigan, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I, Suite 1400  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Tel: (703) 812-5331  
Fax: (703) 243-6410  
E-mail: henter@mwzb.com

**Filed: September 26, 2003**